

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-31, 33-37, 40-46 and 49-81 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 12, 17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 31, 33, 35, 37, 40, 44, 50, 54, 57, 60, 63, 65, 68, 70, 74, 77 and 80 are currently amended. Claims 15 and 47 are now canceled, along with several previously canceled claims. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102

Claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-21, 24-31, 33-37, 40-47 and 49-84 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent no. 7,080,077 to Ramamurthy. Claims 82-84 have been canceled rendering their rejection moot. Claims 15 and 47 are canceled rendering their rejection moot. Each of claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-31, 33-37, 40-46 and 49-81 are allowable for the following reason. Ramamurthy does not disclose each and every element of any of claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-31, 33-37, 40-46 and 49-81. In that sense, the rejection of each of claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-31, 33-37, 40-46 and 49-81 is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, claim 1 recites sending from an enterprise server a signal representing a first SSO credential to retrieve a first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes a second SSO credential corresponding to a second SSO provider having a trust relationship with the first SSO provider.

This feature is not disclosed by Ramamurthy. The Examiner cites column 34, lines 42-67 and column 48, line 38-column 49, line 45. These sections do not disclose or suggest handling access control of multiple secure resources requiring multiple respective SSO credentials. Instead, Ramamurthy discloses a situation wherein two companies form a relationship such that if an employee of company A wishes to access a secure resource available at a company B server, company B will grant access to the employee of company A by virtue of the fact that the employee is an employee of company A. There is no second SSO

credential that is mentioned as being required to obtain the second resource, i.e., Ramamurthy does not disclose that the employee of company A could alternatively simply sign on to the company B server and provide a second SSO credential to obtain the secure resource.

Claims 17 and 33 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2-5 and 9-11 are allowable as being dependent from claim 1. Claims 18-21 and 25-31 are allowable as being dependent from claim 17. Claims 34-38 and 41-43 are allowable as being dependent from claim 33.

In addition, claim 8 recites sending from an enterprise server a signal representing a first SSO credential to retrieve a first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes the first SSO credential; and receiving at an enterprise server a signal representing a second SSO credential generated by a second SSO provider based on a first SSO credential; and sending from the enterprise server a signal representing the second SSO credential to retrieve the first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes the second SSO credential.

This feature is not disclosed by Ramamurthy. The Examiner cites column 7, column, 8, lines 3-41, column 34, lines 42-67 and column 48, line 38-column 49, line 45. These sections do not disclose or suggest handling access control of multiple secure resources requiring multiple respective SSO credentials. Instead, Ramamurthy discloses a situation wherein two companies form a relationship such that if an employee of company A wishes to access a secure resource available at a company B server, company B will grant access to the employee of company A by virtue of the fact that the employee is an employee of company A. There is no second SSO credential that is mentioned as being required to obtain the second resource, i.e., Ramamurthy does not disclose that the employee of company A could alternatively sign on to the company B server and provide a second SSO credential to obtain the secure resource.

Claims 24 and 40 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 8.

Claim 12 requires that a user requests first and second secure resources that respectively require first and second security credentials at an enterprise server, which sends out concurrently the first and second security credentials to obtain the two secure resources for the user.

This feature is not disclosed by Ramamurthy. The Examiner cites column 7, column, 8, lines 3-41, column 34, lines 42-67 and column 48, line 38-column 49, line 45. These sections do not disclose or suggest handling access control of multiple secure resources requiring multiple respective SSO credentials. Instead, Ramamurthy discloses a situation wherein two companies form a relationship such that if an employee of company A wishes to access a secure resource available at a company B server, company B will grant access to the employee of company A by virtue of the fact that the employee is an employee of company A. There is no second SSO credential that is mentioned as being required to obtain the second resource, i.e., Ramamurthy does not disclose that the employee of company A could alternatively sign on to the company B server and provide a second SSO credential to obtain the secure resource.

Therefore, claim 12 is allowable. Claims 13-14 are allowable as being dependent from claim 12. Claims 28 and 44 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 12. Claims 29-30 and 45-46 are allowable as being dependent from claims 28 and 44, respectively.

If the Examiner disagrees with the conclusions set forth above regarding the allowability of Applicant's claims, then Applicant respectfully hereby requests that an interview be conducted between the Examiner and Applicant's undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. . A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jackson & Co., LLP

Dated: December 8, 2006

By



Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant

JACKSON & Co., LLP
6114 La Salle Ave., #507
Oakland, CA 94611-2802

Telephone: 510-652-6418, Ext. 86
Facsimile: 510-652-5691

Customer No.: 30349

Appl. No. 10/004,301
Amendment dated December 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed August 8, 2006

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. . A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jackson & Co., LLP

Dated: December 8, 2006

By



Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant

JACKSON & CO., LLP
6114 La Salle Ave., #507
Oakland, CA 94611-2802

Telephone: 510-652-6418, Ext. 86
Facsimile: 510-652-5691

Customer No.: 30349